

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 14-24 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-7, 20 and 22-24 are amended. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found at least in the previously presented claim 4. Thus, no new matter is added.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejects claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action alleges that there is no support in the specification for the limitation of "a linking information management server," as recited in claim 24. The linking information management server corresponds to the instruction management server 40, as shown in Figs. 1 and 2 and discussed at page 28, lines 18-20 of the specification. The specification discloses at page 24 that the Instruction Sheet Management Server 40 performs saving a "plurality of linking information made by the linking information making device," as recited by claim 24. Thus, there is clear support for the above feature.

The Office Action also alleges that there is no support for "a client server which includes a GUI displaying a plurality of linking information saved in the linking information management server, selecting one of a plurality of linking information and inputting at least one parameter into selected linking information," as recited in claim 24. The client server of claim 24 corresponds to the multifunction device 10, as shown in Fig. 1 and at pages 16-18 of the specification. The GUI corresponds to the GUI 14, as described at page 15, lines 17-24 in the original specification. Page 16 of the specification discloses that the multiple function device 10 contains a GUI 14. Page 18 of the specification further indicates at line 1 that parameters are input to selected linking information via the GUI 14. Consequently, the multiple function device 10 corresponds to the claimed client server. Thus, there is clear support for the "client server," as recited in claim 24 in the specification.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 17-20 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0198904 (Robles) in view of "Cantata: Visual Programming Environment for the Khoros System" (Young); and rejects claims 14-16 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Robles in view of Young and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0039647 (Roche). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The applied references fail to disclose or render obvious "a linking section which makes linking information...the linking information including information to be displayed on respective screens of one or more of the currently-available service processing devices," as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited by independent claims 2, 3, 20 and 24.

The Office Action acknowledges that Robles fails to disclose the above feature, but argues that Young cures the deficiency of Robles. The Office Action alleges that Young discloses the above-quoted features of independent claim 1 at pages 20-24 because Young discloses at pages 22-24 dragging and dropping, and connecting icons for the construction of data flow for a virtual environment. However, a virtual environment does not include currently-available service processing devices because a virtual environment encompasses only non-tangible tasks. On the contrary, the claimed currently-available service processing devices correspond to physical copiers, printers, etc. Thus, Young fails to disclose graphically constructing "linking information" that is used for "currently-available service processing devices," as recited by independent claim 1. Roche fails to at least cure the above deficiency of Young and Robles.

Therefore, independent claims 1-3, 20 and 24 are patentable over the applied references. Claims 4-7, 14-19, and 21-23 are patentable at least for their various dependencies from the independent claims as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Lauren C. Schleh
Registration No. 65,457

JAO:VVR/crh

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: January 28, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461